

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/758,034	01/09/2001	Kwok Leung Lam	NSO-001.01	8283	
25181 75	590 04/18/2006		, EXAMI	, EXAMINER	
FOLEY HOAG, LLP PATENT GROUP, WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST 155 SEAPORT BLVD			OPSASNICK, MICHAEL N		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
BOSTON, MA			2626		
	-		DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
_	09/758,034	09/758,034 LAM ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael N. Opsasnick	2626	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence a	ddress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA' R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS statute, cause the application to become ABANI	TION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this of DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1 2a) □ This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ 3) □ Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice under the closed.	This action is non-final. owance except for formal matters		e merits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,7-18 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 3 and 6 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction at Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Exar 10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 January 2001 is. Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	ndrawn from consideration. nd/or election requirement. miner. /are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by th	•		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for form a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in App priority documents have been rec ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	lication No ceived in this National	l Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date	<i>,</i>	mary (PTO-413) Iail Date mal Patent Application (PT	O-152)

Art Unit: 2626

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The attempt to incorporate subject matter into this application by reference to related applications listed on page 19 of the specification is ineffective because the complete information (such as Patent Number or Publication Number or Application Number) is not entered. Correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 8,10 recites the limitation "the conditional probability distribution function" and "the keyword discriminative function" in lines 2-3 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 3. Claims 3,6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 4. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Art Unit: 2626

As per dependent claims 3,6, the claim limitations pertaining to the particular equation for the score calculation is not explicitly taught by the prior art of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 6. Claims 1,2,4,5,7-10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Thiesson et al (6336108).

As per claim 1, <u>Thiesson et al (6336108)</u> teaches an information processing system performing a method for speech processing comprising receiving an utterance (as input utterance (Fig. 30, subblock 3030; and col. 7 lines 35-56);

"computing a score.....keyword" as computing a score for each HSBN (Fig. 12, Fig. 18) where each score consist of a discrete score (Fig. 19, Fig. 22) derive from a HMM Network (Fig. 22, subblock 1008-1014; see Fig. 23A; and Fig. 31 → states X1,X2,...Xn);

Art Unit: 2626

"indicating based on the score.....model of the keyword" as the HSBN that mark attributes of the acoustic observations (col. 7 line 38-41), wherein the HSBN is connected to the MBN's (col. 7 lines 34-39), yet, the HSBN is not associated with an external hidden variable that is associated with the MBN (col. 7 lines 27-31);

As per claim 2, Thiesson et al (6336108) teaches:

"evaluating a state j of the model.....state k equal the state j" as performing an Expectation-Maximization for all of the HSBN's (which are acoustic observations), for each MBN (col. 7 line 49 – col. 8 line 15; examiner is equating the claimed state j to the states of the HSBN's, and the state k to the MBN parameters).

Claims 4,5,7-10 are processing system claims that implement the method of claims 1-2 and therefore claims 4,5,7-10 are similar in scope and content of claims 1,2; hence, system claims 4,5,7-10 are rejected under the same rationale as presented against claims 1-2 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 09/758,034 Page 5

Art Unit: 2626

8. Claims 11-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by <u>Wu</u> ("Subsyllable Based Discriminative Segmental Bayesian Network for Mandarin Speech Keyword Spotting; IEE 1997 Proc.for Vis. Image Signal Processing; Vol. 144, No. 2, April 1997, pp 65-71).

As per claims 11-18, <u>Wu</u> teaches maintaining syllables for a Mandarin speech keyword spotting system using context dependent subsyllables(abstract) using HMM for the speech signals (pg 67, col. 2 lines 45-57) in part using at least three subword units (pg 66, col. 1, first paragraph under "2 System Architecture"; and using the system to receive an utterance, compute scores based on the utterance and the models, and detecting the existence of a word based on the scores (as taking test utterances – pg 69, "6 Experimental Results"; training the models (pg 69, section 6.1), and performing and scoring the recognition results – (page 70, Table 1, Table 2, and pg 71, Table 3).

Conclusion

- 9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please see related art listed on the PTO-892 form.
- 10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Opsasnick, telephone number (571)272-7623, who is available Tuesday-Thursday, 9am-4pm.

Art Unit: 2626

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Richemond Dorvil, can be reached at (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mno 4/15/06

Michael N. Opsasnick

Art Unit 2626